



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/534,826	01/09/2006	Minoru Akaishi	052514	8864
38834 7590 10/07/2008 WESTERMAN, HATTORI, DANIELS & ADRIAN, LLP 1250 CONNECTICUT AVENUE, NW SUITE 700 WASHINGTON, DC 20036				
EXAMINER				
STALDER, MELISSA A				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
4162				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
10/07/2008		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/534,826

Applicant(s)

AKAISHI ET AL.

Examiner

MELISSA STALDER

Art Unit

4162

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 09 January 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☒ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-946)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SI/ICE)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 11-21-05 and 05-13-05
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1 and 2 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hiraki (US 6,337,060) in view of Sundback (US 5,047,182) in view of Slutz (EP 0 482 372). Hiraki teaches a method for producing diamond particles where the silicon is removed from the diamond powder. The diamond powder was made of 0-2 micron size grade diamonds (examples 2 and 3). Further, Hiraki teaches that the grain size of the diamond can be as small as 5 nm and under 200 nm (example 1 and example 2). Hiraki does not teach freeze-drying or sintering without a sintering aid. Sundback teaches freeze-forming a slurry made of inorganic sinterable particulates and then drying the piece so formed by a predominantly sublimative process followed by sintering (col. 1, lines 17-24). Slutz teaches sintering of a polycrystalline CNB/diamond in the absence of a sintering aid material (col. 1, lines 11-15). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the diamond particles of Hiraki with the freeze-drying of Sundback and the process of sintering without a sintering aid of Slutz because Sundback teaches that freeze drying can be used with a variety of inorganic powders because freeze drying can overcome

thermal drying stresses which would be destructive. Additionally, an ostensible "freeze-drying" process allows for capillary forces between the inorganic particles, thereby pulling them together during drying to yield a denser, smoother surface (col. 3, lines 25-37; col. 3, lines 58-66). Further, Slutz teaches that sintering the polycrystalline CBN/diamond conjoint compacts make the masses fully dense and thermally-stable (col. 2, lines 16-22).

3. Regarding claim 2, Hiraki teaches that the method for producing hydrophilic diamond particles removes the impurities and contaminants from the diamond particles that cause the diamond powders to exhibit a light to dark grayish color (col. 1, lines 41-58). Because the impurities are removed, the diamond particles will no longer be dark but will be light transparent, which is what diamonds without impurities will appear. According to example 2 in Hiraki, Raman spectroscopy shows a clear record showing exclusively the spectrum for a diamond which will inherently be a light transparent crystal.

4. Claims 3-4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hiraki (US 6,337,060) in view of Sundback (US 5,047,182) in view of Slutz (EP 0 482 372) as in claims 1 and 2, further in view of Yazu (US 4,610,699). Slutz teaches a high pressure/ high temperature apparatus which sinters at a pressure of 80 Kbars (8 GPa), which is essentially the same as the present claims. Further, Slutz teaches that the temperature should be from about 1500 to 2300 (col. 4, lines 3-10). Hiraki, Sundback, and Slutz do not teach the use of a Ta or Mo capsule. Yazu teaches a reaction vessel (capsule) that is sealed containing the diamond powder for sintering. The vessel can be made of Ta or

Art Unit: 4162

Mo (Example 1; claim 4). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the capsule of Yazu with the method of producing diamonds in Hiraki, Sundback and Slutz because Yazu teaches that a diamond sintered in this way has superior heat-resistance and abrasion-resistance (abstract).

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to MELISSA STALDER whose telephone number is (571)270-5832. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday, 8:00-5:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jennifer McNeil can be reached on 571-272-1540. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 4162

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

MS

/Jennifer McNeil/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 4162